
Greedy and CoDy: Counterfactual Explainers for Dynamic Graphs

Zhan Qu¹ Daniel Gomm¹ Michael Färber¹

Abstract

Temporal Graph Neural Networks (TGNNs), crucial for modeling dynamic graphs with time-varying interactions, face a significant challenge in explainability due to their complex model structure. Counterfactual explanations, crucial for understanding model decisions, examine how input graph changes affect outcomes. This paper introduces two novel counterfactual explanation methods for TGNNs: **GreeDy** (Greedy Explainer for Dynamic Graphs) and **CoDy** (Counterfactual Explainer for Dynamic Graphs). They treat explanations as a search problem, seeking input graph alterations that alter model predictions. **GreeDy** uses a simple, greedy approach, while **CoDy** employs a sophisticated Monte Carlo Tree Search algorithm. Experiments show both methods effectively generate clear explanations. Notably, **CoDy** outperforms GreeDy and existing factual methods, with up to 59% higher success rate in finding significant counterfactual inputs. This highlights **CoDy**'s potential in clarifying TGNN decision-making, increasing their transparency and trustworthiness in practice.

1. Introduction

Recent research has been particularly focused on the deployment and application of deep neural networks to graph data, a domain that continues to gain momentum (Wu et al., 2020). These models, known as Graph Neural Networks (GNNs), have been successful in multiple areas. For instance, GNNs have contributed to drug discovery by aiding in protein folding (Jumper et al., 2021) and enhancing the accuracy of weather forecasting models (Lam et al., 2022).

GNNs, however, have primarily been applied to static graphs, where the graph structure remains constant over time. Yet, many real-world scenarios are better represented by dynamic graphs, which evolve with time. Examples include social networks with evolving relationships, road

networks with changing traffic conditions, and financial transaction networks with ongoing transactions (Zhao et al., 2019; Rossi et al., 2020; Souza et al., 2022). In such dynamic graphs, nodes and edges can be added or removed, and their features can evolve over time. Dynamic graphs are typically depicted as a sequence of events marked by timestamps, where each event signifies a modification in the graph structure, including the addition or deletion of nodes or edges. Neglecting the temporal aspect in these graphs can lead to overlooking vital temporal information and can result in erroneous model predictions (Xu et al., 2020). Addressing this, Temporal Graph Neural Networks (TGNNs) have been developed, specifically tailored to handle dynamic graph data effectively (Trivedi et al., 2019; Xu et al., 2020; Ma et al., 2020; Rossi et al., 2020; Makarov et al., 2021; Souza et al., 2022).

Despite the increasing focus on deep models for dynamic graphs (Longa et al., 2023), a significant challenge remains: these models often act as "black boxes," offering little to no insight into their decision-making processes (Vu & Thai, 2022). This lack of transparency is particularly problematic in critical fields such as finance and healthcare, where understanding the rationale behind model predictions is crucial (Prado-Romero et al., 2023). Regulatory bodies are increasingly mandating explainability in these areas (European Parliament, 2021). Current explanation methods, however, are predominantly designed for static graphs and do not adequately account for the temporal dynamics inherent in dynamic graphs (He et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2023; Xia et al., 2023; Chen & Ying, 2023).

Most existing explanation methods for temporal models require deep access to the model's internals and are limited to factual explanations—those that identify specific nodes and edges contributing to a prediction (Tan et al., 2022). However, they fall short in exploring how changes in the input graph could lead to different predictions. Counterfactual explanations, which illustrate how altering elements in the graph could change the outcome, are gaining popularity for their ability to establish causal relationships and highlight decision boundaries (Byrne, 2019; Prado-Romero et al., 2023). They offer actionable insights, help identify biases, and can uncover potential adversarial examples (Lucic et al., 2022). Yet, no existing methods for dynamic graphs effectively leverage the potential of counterfactual explanations.

¹Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Karlsruhe, Germany. Correspondence to: Zhan Qu <zhan.qu@kit.edu>.

Temporal graphs possess temporal relationships that may naturally establish causal relationships between nodes, making counterfactual explanation methods especially suitable for TGNN models.

Addressing this gap, this paper introduces two novel model-agnostic counterfactual explanation approaches for dynamic graph models. The first, **GreeDy** (**G**reedy **E**xplainer for **D**ynamic **G**raphs), adopts a simple greedy search strategy, providing a baseline for counterfactual explanations in dynamic graph models. The second, **CoDy** (**C**ounterfactual **E**xplainer for **D**ynamic **G**raphs), utilizes principles from the Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) for efficient traversal of the search space. Both methods aim to identify counterfactual examples by altering a subset of past events in the input data, thereby changing the model’s prediction. However, due to the specific objectives of the method, counterfactual explanations are not always achievable. Several search strategies have been developed, improving both the efficiency and effectiveness of the search for counterfactual explanations. In scenarios where counterfactual explanations cannot be found, a well-defined fallback strategy is employed to identify the most optimal alternative that closely aligns with the nature of a counterfactual explanation.

The comprehensive assessment conducted demonstrates that CoDy stands out as a highly efficient method for generating counterfactual explanations for TGNN models, such as TGN (Rossi et al., 2020) and TGAT (Xu et al., 2020). This effectiveness is highlighted by its superior performance when compared to both GreeDy and the sophisticated factual explainer T-GNNExplainer, specifically in the context of future link prediction tasks across three distinct datasets, UCI-Messages, UCI-forums, and Wikipedia. The evaluation was conducted separately for correct predictions and wrong predictions made by the TGNN models, as this approach allows for a more nuanced understanding of the model’s performance, highlighting its reasoning for accurate predictions and identifying areas for improvement where inaccuracies occur. Additionally, the findings indicate that the integration of diverse search strategies aimed at identifying the most impactful past events notably augments the abilities of these explainers to uncover pertinent counterfactual explanations. This suggests a promising direction for further enhancing the explanatory power and precision of such models.

This paper makes several significant contributions to the field: (1) It pioneers the exploration of counterfactual explanations in the context of explaining Temporal Graph Neural Networks (TGNNs), offering actionable and human-understandable insights; (2) It develops a more appropriate evaluation framework specifically tailored for assessing counterfactual explanations; (3) It introduces various search strategies designed to enhance the effectiveness and effi-

ciency of identifying potential explanations. ¹

2. Related Work

Numerous explanation methods for GNN on static graphs have been developed. Explainability methods for Graph Neural Networks typically utilize gradients (Baldassarre & Azizpour, 2019; Pope et al., 2019), perturbations (Ying et al., 2019; Luo et al., 2020), decomposition rules (Schnake et al., 2020), surrogate models (Huang et al., 2020; Vu & Thai, 2020), Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) (Yuan et al., 2021), and generative models (Yuan et al., 2020) to obtain the explanatory subgraph. Compared with static GNN, the explainability of Temporal Graph Neural Networks (TGNNs) remains challenging and less investigated.

Temporal graphs come in various forms, with Discrete-Time Dynamic Graphs (DTDGs) and Continuous-Time Dynamic Graphs (CTDGs) being the most prevalent. DTDGs are characterized by a sequence of static snapshot graphs, each representing a distinct time interval (Kazemi et al., 2020). The majority of existing research has been centered around providing explanations for predictions on DTDGs. The process of explaining predictions in DTDGs typically involves aggregating feature importances across different graph snapshots (He et al., 2022). The methods for these explanations predominantly rely on surrogate models (He et al., 2022), temporal decomposition strategies (Xie et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2023), and model-specific features (Fan et al., 2021).

On the other hand, Continuous-Time Dynamic Graphs (CTDGs) are represented as a series of timestamped events (Kazemi et al., 2020). These graphs are especially pertinent in real-world scenarios such as social networks, where the continuous emergence and disappearance of nodes and edges lead to their ongoing evolution. This makes CTDGs particularly valuable for real-world applications. Despite their importance, the field of creating explanations for CTDGs remains relatively unexplored. To date, there are only two explainers specifically designed for CTDGs: T-GNNExplainer (Xia et al., 2023) and TempME (Chen & Ying, 2023). Both of these explainers employ a perturbation-based approach to generate factual explanations, identifying a crucial subset of past events that significantly influence the model’s predictions.

T-GNNExplainer (Xia et al., 2023) employs a search-based perturbation approach, utilizing Monte Carlo Tree Search and a Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP)-based navigator to predict event importances and guide search space exploration. This method, an adaptation of the SubgraphX (Yuan et al., 2021) approach for static GNNs, uniquely determines the size of an explanation autonomously, incorporating spatial

¹The source code and implementations are available at: <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/CoDy-F2CF>

and temporal constraints in its search. Conversely, TempME (Chen & Ying, 2023) focuses on identifying key temporal motifs – recurring, significant substructures in dynamic graphs – to explain predictions. It selects these motifs from the local neighborhood of nodes relevant to the prediction, using a GNN trained to assess motif importance. This helps construct explanations that reflect the combined influence of these temporal motifs.

Counterfactual explanations are proven to be highly effective explanations, as they overcome many problems in interpretability and accountability (Wachter et al., 2017). Additionally, counterfactual explanations have already been successfully applied to regular GNN (Tan et al., 2022; Lucic et al., 2022), making their application in explaining models on dynamic graphs a logical next step.

As ignored by previous works on temporal explanation, the current paper aims for counterfactual explanations that are human-understandable and insightful based on an adapted Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) algorithm with different searching strategies. Considering the limited existing research and their significant practical relevance, the focus is directed towards CTDGs.

The current paper advances the capabilities of explanation methods for black-box prediction models on dynamic graphs. It addresses the identified research gap by proposing GreeDy and CoDy, two instance-level post-hoc explainers that provide counterfactual explanations for TGNNs operating on CTDGs. The proposed methods are model agnostic, treating the explained model as black-box with model access only required on the level of inputs and predictions.

3. Preliminaries and Problem Formulation

Explaining Future Link Predictions The task of a future link prediction model, denoted as $f : \{\mathcal{G}(t_i), \varepsilon_i\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, involves forecasting whether an upcoming edge addition event, symbolized as $\varepsilon_i = \{e_j, a_{e_j, t_i}^{edge}, \text{add}, t_i\}$, is likely to occur. This prediction relies on the history of events $\mathcal{G}(t_i) = \{\varepsilon_l | \varepsilon_l \in \mathcal{G}, t_l \leq t_i\}$ in the temporal graph \mathcal{G} up to time t_i . The model f is assumed to provide predictions as real-valued logits, which are the quantile functions of the standard logistical distribution. These logits reflect the model’s confidence in the event’s occurrence. Model f can be any suitable function, such as a Temporal Graph Neural Network (TGNN) trained for this task. In this context, the model is also known as the link prediction function. A binary classification function $p : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ transforms the output of f into a definitive prediction:

$$p(f(\mathcal{G}(t_i), \varepsilon_i)) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } f(\mathcal{G}(t_i), \varepsilon_i) \geq 0 \\ 0, & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

A result of 1 indicates a prediction for the future link’s occurrence, while 0 indicates its non-occurrence. An explainer, denoted as $ex(\cdot)$, is a function that provides a rationale for the model’s prediction. For future link predictions, $ex(\cdot)$ takes the link prediction function f , the event in question ε_i , and the past events $\mathcal{G}(t_i)$, and yields an explanation for the prediction.

Counterfactual Examples in Future Link Prediction

Counterfactual explanations offer insightful and actionable explanations for specific predictions, making them highly relevant for interpreting predictions from complex deep graph models like TGNNs. A counterfactual example $\mathcal{X}_{\varepsilon_i}$ related to a prediction about a future link ε_i consists of a critical subset of past events $\mathcal{X}_{\varepsilon_i} \subseteq \mathcal{G}(t_i)$ necessary for the original prediction. This necessity is defined by the following condition:

$$p(f(\mathcal{G}(t_i), \varepsilon_i)) \neq p(f((\mathcal{G}(t_i) \setminus \mathcal{X}_{\varepsilon_i}), \varepsilon_i)) \quad (2)$$

For any given future link ε_i , multiple or no counterfactual examples may exist. The set containing all existing counterfactual examples for a potential future link ε_i is denoted as Ψ_{ε_i} . A counterfactual explainer for future link prediction, ex , is a function that inputs a link prediction function f , a temporal graph $\mathcal{G}(t_i)$, and a future link ε_i . It outputs a subset of the original graph’s events as the counterfactual explanation:

$$ex : \{f, \mathcal{G}(t_i), \varepsilon_i\} \rightarrow \bigcup_{k=0}^{|\mathcal{G}(t_i) \setminus \varepsilon_i|} \binom{(\mathcal{G}(t_i) \setminus \varepsilon_i)}{k} \quad (3)$$

This output represents any combination of past events, adhering to the notation for permutations of a size k as per (Stanley, 1986).

Objectives for Counterfactual Explanation When explaining future link predictions via counterfactual examples, two primary goals are identified:

1. **Maximize Discoveries:** The first goal is to identify a counterfactual example for as many cases as possible. Considering the exponential increase in potential past event combinations, the explainer ex aims to efficiently pinpoint necessary explanations. This is quantified by maximizing the following expression:

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{G}} \sum_{\varepsilon_i \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{1}(ex(f, \mathcal{G}(t_i), \varepsilon_i) \in \Psi_{\varepsilon_i}) \quad (4)$$

Here, $\mathbb{1}(ex(f, \mathcal{G}(t_i), \varepsilon_i) \in \Psi_{\varepsilon_i})$ indicates whether ex finds a counterfactual example.

2. **Minimize Complexity:** When multiple counterfactual examples are available, the explainer should choose the simplest yet most informative one. This follows Occam’s razor principle, suggesting that explanations should be concise, containing only relevant details (Yuan et al., 2023; Tan et al., 2022):

$$\arg \min_{\mathcal{X}_{\varepsilon_i}^j \in \Psi_{\varepsilon_i}} |\mathcal{X}_{\varepsilon_i}^j| \quad (5)$$

Here, $|\mathcal{X}_{\varepsilon_i}^j|$ denotes the number of events in $\mathcal{X}_{\varepsilon_i}^j$.

4. Proposed Methods: GreeDy and CoDy

This section offers a concise overview of two explanation methods, GreeDy and CoDy, aimed at elucidating predictions in future link prediction models on CTDGs. These methods revolve around efficiently navigating a defined search space for counterfactual examples.

Search Space The search space consists of potential counterfactual examples, each being a subset of past events relative to a future link in a dynamic graph. Mathematically, this space, S_{ε_i} , encompasses all combinations of past events, excluding the future link ε_i .

Given the complexity, the search is streamlined through spatial and temporal constraints, reducing the scope to a manageable subset of past events within a certain range of the target event.

Search Space Constraints Spatial constraints limit the search to events within a defined range of the target event, while temporal constraints focus on the most recent events. The resulting constrained space, \hat{S}_{ε_i} , still poses computational challenges but is more feasible for exploration.

$$\hat{S}_{\varepsilon_i} = \bigcup_{l=0}^{C(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon_i, k, m_{max})} \binom{C(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon_i, k, m_{max})}{l} \quad (6)$$

Search Tree Structure To facilitate the search, a partial search tree P is constructed (see Figure 1), with each node representing a unique combination of past events. The root node, denoted as n_{root} , starts with no perturbations and is expanded to include child nodes that represent incremental additions of past events. This structure supports an efficient search for simple counterfactual explanations.

Both GreeDy and CoDy build upon this structured search space. GreeDy adopts a direct approach, iteratively exploring the most promising paths in the search tree, while CoDy, more intricate, employs a Monte Carlo Tree Search-based method, considering additional node attributes and employing a more iterative, exploratory process.

4.1. Selection Strategies

Selection strategies guide the exploration of unexplored nodes in a search tree, impacting the efficiency and effectiveness of the search for counterfactual examples. Four primary strategies are proposed:

- **Random:** As a baseline, this strategy randomly selects among the available nodes.
- **Temporal:** Ranks the events based on their recency. Recent events are considered more influential.
- **Spatio-Temporal:** Integrates both spatial proximity and temporal recency. Events with closer spatial distance are ranked higher. Events with the same spatial distance are then ranked by their recency.
- **Local-Gradient:** The local-gradient selection strategy ranks alternative events based on their local gradient, which is the change in prediction caused by omitting an event from the input graph.

Each strategy offers a unique heuristic: Temporal and Spatio-Temporal strategies leverage structural information of the graph, while the Local-Gradient strategy examines the isolated effect of events on predictions. The Δ -function is used in the Local-Gradient strategy to measure the shift in prediction, indicating the potential for a different classification outcome. These strategies are designed to enhance the search algorithm’s ability to identify counterfactual examples efficiently.

$$\Delta(pred_{ori}, pred_j) = \begin{cases} pred_{ori} - pred_j, & \text{if } pred_{ori} \geq 0 \\ pred_j - pred_{ori}, & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

4.2. GreeDy: Counterfactual Search in Dynamic Graph Models

The core of GreeDy is a greedy algorithm that navigates the search space, starting from the root node and progressively exploring nodes that most significantly alter predictions. The Algorithm and an example of GreeDy is provided in Appendix A.

In each iteration, GreeDy samples l child nodes based on a selection strategy, focusing on those with the greatest impact on prediction change. The algorithm assesses the potential of each child node in shifting the prediction further from its original state. If a node is found to be a counterfactual example, or if no further significant shifts in prediction are possible, the search concludes.

The algorithm’s output is the best explanation found, represented by the most impactful perturbation set in the search

tree. This could either be a counterfactual example or the set leading to the largest non-counterfactual prediction shift.

4.3. CoDy: Counterfactual Explainer for Dynamic Graph Models

CoDy utilizes an adapted Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) algorithm to identify counterfactual examples in dynamic graph models. MCTS algorithm has already been applied to obtain factual explanations for static GNNs (Yuan et al., 2021) and TGNNs (Xia et al., 2023). CoDy’s process involves iterations of Selection, Simulation, Expansion, and Backpropagation, with each step specifically tailored for counterfactual search in dynamic graphs.

An example scenario illustrates CoDy’s process in action (Figure 1). The search algorithm (Algorithm 1) initiates with the selection of a node, n_j , for expansion. This process begins at the root and employs a recursive child selection policy. A node is suitable for expansion if it is not associated with child nodes ($children_j = \emptyset$) and lacks a prediction score ($prediction_j = \text{null}$). The child selection algorithm aims to balance exploration and exploitation within the search tree. The selection of a child node is determined by a selection score, formulated as:

$$selection_score(n_k) = \alpha \cdot score_k + \beta \cdot score_{exploration}(n_k) \quad (8)$$

where $score_{exploration}(n_k)$ is derived from the ‘Upper Confidence Bound 1’ and $score_k$ denotes the exploitation score. Parameters α and β adjust the balance between exploration and exploitation.

Upon selecting a node, the simulation step involves predicting the outcome for n_j . The expansion step updates the node’s attributes and adds child nodes, expanding the search tree:

$$score_j \leftarrow \max \left(0, \frac{\Delta(prediction_{orig}, prediction_j)}{|prediction_{orig}|} \right) \quad (9)$$

Backpropagation updates the search tree from the parent of the expanded node to the root, recalculating exploitation scores and assessing node selectability. The search concludes after a predefined number of iterations or when all nodes have been explored.

The algorithm selects the best counterfactual example, prioritizing minimal complexity. In the absence of counterfactuals, a fallback strategy is applied, it involves choosing the set of perturbations that has the greatest potential to significantly change the prediction’s outcome in the opposite direction:

$$n_{best} \leftarrow \arg \max_{n_j \in P} \Delta(prediction_{orig}, prediction_j) \quad (10)$$

The search is optimized with constraints to minimize explanation complexity, caching for reducing redundant calculations, and a two-stage approximation-confirmation approach for faster link prediction.

5. Experiments

5.1. Experimental Setup

Datasets The explainers are evaluated on three different datasets: Wikipedia (Kumar et al., 2019), UCI-Messages (Kunegis, 2013), and UCI-Forums (Kunegis, 2013). The statistics of the datasets are provided in Table 1. Both UCI datasets are online social networks with no node or edge features included. Wikipedia dataset consists of events representing edits of Wikipedia pages. It is a bipartite graph and the edges are associated with attributes that represent the associated edit texts.

Dataset	# Nodes	# Edges	# Unique Edges	Timespan	Graph Type
UCI-Messages	1,899	59,835	20,296	196 days	Unipartite
UCI-Forums	1,421	33,720	7,089	165 days	Bipartite
Wikipedia	9,227	157,474	18,257	30 days	Bipartite

Table 1. Statistics for datasets

Target Model The target model that is explained in all experiments is the dynamic graph model TGN (Rossi et al., 2020). TGN is used as the target model since it is popular within research (Souza et al., 2022) and achieves state-of-the-art performance in different tasks on dynamic graphs (Rossi et al., 2020; Souza et al., 2022). To its users, the model mostly remains a black-box with little transparency over what leads to a specific prediction. The TGAT model (Xu et al., 2020) is also employed, but the outcomes observed were akin to those obtained using the TGN model. As a result, the findings specific to TGAT are not included in the paper, but the code is available in the repository.

Configurations For the experiments, the TGN model is configured with a Gated Recurrent Unit (GRU) (Cho et al., 2014) as the memory updater, graph attention as an embedding module, last message aggregation, and the identity memory function. This corresponds to the TGN-attn configuration presented as the default configuration in the original paper (Rossi et al., 2020). After training for 30 epochs with early stopping on the model accuracy, the TGN model archives a high average precision: UCI-Messages Transductive 85.86%, Inductive 83.26%; UCI-Forums Transductive 92.97%, Inductive 89.39%; Wikipedia Transductive 97.80%, Inductive 97.39%.

Explainers T-GNNExplainer (Xia et al., 2023), a method for explaining predictions on CTDGs, is used as the baseline. TempME (Chen & Ying, 2023), another explainer for CTDGs, isn’t included due to unavailable code at this time.




Figure 1. Illustration of CoDy

Algorithm 1: Search algorithm of CoDy.

Input: Link prediction function f , input graph \mathcal{G} , explained event ε_i , selection strategy δ , maximum number of iterations it_{max}

Output: best explanation found

- 1 $prediction_{orig} \leftarrow f(\mathcal{G}(t_i), \varepsilon_i)$;
- 2 $n_{root} \leftarrow (\emptyset, null, null, \emptyset, 0, null, 1)$;
- 3 $it \leftarrow 0$;
- 4 **while** $it < it_{max}$ and n_{root} is selectable **do**
- 5 $n_{selected} \leftarrow \text{select}(n_{root}, \delta)$;
- 6 **simulate** $(n_{selected}, f, \mathcal{G}, \varepsilon_i)$;
- 7 **expand** $(n_{selected}, prediction_{orig})$;
- 8 **backpropagate** $(parent_{selected})$;
- 9 $it \leftarrow it + 1$;
- 10 **end**
- 11 $n_{best} \leftarrow \text{select_best}(n_{root})$;
- 12 **return** s_{best}

Other baselines such as GNNExplainer (Ying et al., 2019) and PGExplainer (Vu & Thai, 2020) that are used in previous papers are not included since they are not state-of-the-art (Xia et al., 2023; Chen & Ying, 2023).

Given the inherent differences between factual and counterfactual explanations, the evaluation focuses separately on the necessity and sufficiency aspects. This dual assessment allows a nuanced understanding of both factual and counterfactual dimensions in explanations. Unless otherwise stated, experiments maintain consistent settings across explainers for a fair comparison.

T-GNNExplainer is implemented as per its original design, with 500 iterations and 30 candidate events considered. GreeDy’s candidate event limit is set at 64, sampling up to 10 events per iteration. For CoDy, the limit is similar at 64 candidate events, with a maximum of 300 iterations and hyperparameters $\alpha = 2$ and $\beta = 1$ to balance exploration and exploitation.

Evaluation Metrics Fidelity measures the identification of key input features, with different formulations used in previous studies (Yuan et al., 2023; Xia et al., 2023; Prado-

Romero et al., 2023; Lucic et al., 2022; Amara et al., 2022). This work calculates fidelity in relation to the model, adapting scores fid_- and fid_+ for CTDGs:

$$fid_- = 1 - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}(p(f(\mathcal{G}(t_i)), \varepsilon_i) = p(f(\mathcal{X}_{\varepsilon_i}, \varepsilon_i))) \quad (11)$$

$$fid_+ = 1 - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}(p(f(\mathcal{G}(t_i)), \varepsilon_i) = p(f((\mathcal{G}(t_i) \setminus \mathcal{X}_{\varepsilon_i}), \varepsilon_i))) \quad (12)$$

Here, $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_N$ are possible future links and $\mathcal{X}_{\varepsilon_1}, \dots, \mathcal{X}_{\varepsilon_N}$ are the respective explanations for the predictions of their occurrences. The indicator function $\mathbb{1}(a = b)$ returns 1, if a is equal to b , else it returns 0.

For these two metrics, fid_- measures sufficiency, while fid_+ assesses necessity. Both scores range from 0 to 1, with higher values indicating better performance. The weighted harmonic mean, $char$, combines these scores for a comprehensive assessment.

Sparsity, another key metric, measures explanation complexity. Lower values are preferred, indicating less complex explanations:

$$sparsity = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|\mathcal{X}_{\varepsilon_i}|}{|C(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon_i, k, mmax)|} \quad (13)$$

The evaluation also encompasses runtime, which assesses the duration required for a method to generate explanations; search iterations, examining the influence of varying search iteration counts on the explanations; and Jaccard similarity, a metric comparing the overlap between explanations derived from different methods. The corresponding results are detailed in Appendices E, F, and G.

	Fidelity+						Sparsity					
	UCI-Messages		UCI-Forums		Wikipedia		UCI-Messages		UCI-Forums		Wikipedia	
	corr.	wrg.	corr.	wrg.	corr.	wrg.	corr.	wrg.	corr.	wrg.	corr.	wrg.
T-GNNExplainer	0.10	0.25	0.05	0.28	0.05	0.22	0.43	0.35	0.29	0.35	0.33	0.43
GreeDy- <i>rand.</i>	0.02	0.08	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.11	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.02
GreeDy- <i>temp.</i>	0.14	0.33	0.43	0.31	0.10	0.30	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.03	0.06	0.03
GreeDy- <i>spa-temp.</i>	0.20	0.38	0.46	0.30	0.14	0.39	0.08	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.07	0.04
GreeDy- <i>gradient</i>	0.11	0.35	0.29	0.27	0.08	0.28	0.06	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.05	0.02
CoDy- <i>rand.</i>	0.11	0.36	0.32	0.31	0.14	0.43	0.08	0.05	0.09	0.06	0.07	0.07
CoDy- <i>temp.</i>	0.14	0.39	0.39	<u>0.38</u>	0.13	0.48	0.07	0.04	0.10	0.05	0.06	0.06
CoDy- <i>spa-temp.</i>	0.20	<u>0.41</u>	<u>0.44</u>	0.36	0.18	<u>0.53</u>	0.06	0.04	0.08	0.04	0.07	0.05
CoDy- <i>gradient</i>	0.17	0.42	0.40	0.41	<u>0.16</u>	0.54	0.07	0.05	0.09	0.06	0.07	0.06

	Fidelity-						Char					
	UCI-Messages		UCI-Forums		Wikipedia		UCI-Messages		UCI-Forums		Wikipedia	
	corr.	wrg.	corr.	wrg.	corr.	wrg.	corr.	wrg.	corr.	wrg.	corr.	wrg.
T-GNNExplainer	0.82	0.83	0.57	0.72	<u>0.90</u>	0.69	0.17	0.39	0.08	0.40	0.09	0.34
GreeDy- <i>rand.</i>	0.34	0.97	0.28	0.99	0.57	0.93	0.04	0.14	0.08	0.12	0.09	0.19
GreeDy- <i>temp.</i>	0.56	0.98	0.61	0.98	0.77	0.90	0.22	0.49	0.50	0.47	0.17	0.45
GreeDy- <i>spa-temp.</i>	0.70	0.96	0.64	0.95	0.82	0.88	<u>0.31</u>	0.54	<u>0.53</u>	0.46	0.23	0.54
GreeDy- <i>gradient</i>	0.67	0.98	0.64	0.99	0.72	0.90	0.18	0.51	0.39	0.42	0.14	0.43
CoDy- <i>rand.</i>	0.68	0.95	0.66	0.97	0.88	0.88	0.19	0.52	0.43	0.47	0.24	0.58
CoDy- <i>temp.</i>	0.69	0.96	0.66	0.98	0.88	0.88	0.23	0.55	0.49	<u>0.54</u>	0.22	0.62
CoDy- <i>spa-temp.</i>	<u>0.72</u>	0.95	0.69	0.93	0.91	0.86	0.31	<u>0.57</u>	0.54	0.52	0.30	<u>0.65</u>
CoDy- <i>gradient</i>	0.70	0.96	<u>0.68</u>	0.95	0.88	<u>0.90</u>	0.27	0.58	0.50	0.57	<u>0.27</u>	0.68

Table 2. Results on the *fidelity+*, *sparsity*, *fidelity-*, and *char* scores of the different explanation methods for explaining correct and wrong predictions. The best result for each experimental setting is **bold**, and the second best is underlined.

5.2. Results

5.2.1. NECESSITY OF EXPLANATIONS

Table 2 presents a comprehensive view of the fid_+ scores in various experimental scenarios. In all but one scenario, CoDy, employing either *spatio-temporal* or *local-gradient* selection strategies, emerges as the most effective. A consistent trend is observed where CoDy-*spatio-temporal* excels in explaining correct predictions across datasets, while CoDy-*local-gradient* is superior in elucidating wrong predictions. GreeDy-*spatio-temporal* shows optimal performance for correct predictions in the UCI-Messages and UCI-Forums datasets. The *random* selection strategy is generally less effective compared to the others, except for CoDy-*temporal*, which is marginally inferior to CoDy-*random* for correct predictions on the Wikipedia dataset. This indicates that the *temporal*, *spatio-temporal*, and *local-gradient* strategies enhance the ability of GreeDy and CoDy to uncover necessary explanations, as evidenced by their superior fid_+ scores over the *random* strategy, especially in the case of GreeDy.

However, focusing solely on the fid_+ metric overlooks the objective of minimizing explanation complexity. Therefore, the sparsity of explanations is also crucial. Table 2 illustrates the conciseness of explanations provided by different explainers, showing that GreeDy and CoDy generally offer more succinct explanations than T-GNNExplainer, highlighting the complexity advantage of counterfactual ex-

planations. It’s notable that GreeDy variants consistently yield lower sparsity scores compared to their CoDy counterparts. Nonetheless, considering these sparsity values in isolation can be misleading, as minimally sparse explanations are only advantageous if they also pinpoint crucial information. For example, while GreeDy-*random* achieves low sparsity scores, it falls short in fid_+ score compared to other GreeDy variants. Higher fid_+ values are preferable, coupled with lower sparsity. A figure that displays the cumulative distribution of necessary explanations across varying sparsity levels is provided in Appendix C.

The disparity between explanations for correct and wrong predictions is particularly pronounced in the UCI-Messages and Wikipedia datasets. For incorrect predictions, all explainers identify necessary explanations more than twice as frequently compared to correct predictions. This phenomenon could be attributed to the fundamental difference between correct and wrong predictions. In the case of incorrect predictions, the model misconstrues past information, making the identification of misleading information comparatively straightforward. Conversely, for correct predictions, identifying a counterfactual example requires omitting information to render the prediction incorrect, which can be challenging if most past data aligns with the prediction. Despite this disparity, explaining incorrect predictions is arguably more insightful, as it focuses solely on elucidating the target model without introducing biases associated with correct predictions.

Overall, CoDy, particularly with the *local-gradient* and *spatio-temporal* strategies, is most adept at achieving the dual objectives of maximizing counterfactual example discovery and minimizing explanation complexity. GreeDy-*spatio-temporal* also demonstrates commendable performance across most settings.

5.2.2. SUFFICIENCY OF EXPLANATIONS

Table 2 delineates the performance of different methods according to this metric. Given that T-GNNExplainer is designed to provide factual explanations, it is anticipated to excel in the *fid₋* metric. Indeed, it demonstrates superior performance for correct predictions in the UCI-Messages dataset. However, in other settings, different explainers emerge as more effective. This variation in performance could stem from the implementation nuances of T-GNNExplainer, specifically, the approximation strategy used in the original implementation as proposed by its authors (Xia et al., 2023). This strategy, which involves restricting past events to a *k*-hop neighborhood and processing input events in batches, might introduce discrepancies between the approximated and actual model outputs, potentially impacting the *fid₋* scores.

An intriguing observation is the disparity in the performance of CoDy and GreeDy between correct and wrong predictions. CoDy variants outperform GreeDy counterparts for correct predictions. However, for wrong predictions, GreeDy approaches exceed CoDy configurations. Remarkably, the *fid₋* scores for CoDy and GreeDy in the context of incorrect predictions are consistently high, exceeding 0.86 across all settings. This underscores the efficacy of these methods in explicating wrong predictions, suggesting that counterfactual explanations inherently possess a high degree of sufficiency for wrong predictions.

Moreover, CoDy with the *spatio-temporal* and *local-gradient* strategies often parallels or surpasses T-GNNExplainer in *fid₋* scores. The robust *fid₋* scores achieved by these strategies affirm that the explanations they generate are largely sufficient for explaining predictions, capturing relevant information effectively.

5.2.3. CONVERGENT ANALYSIS OF SUFFICIENCY AND NECESSITY

The characterization score *char* synthesizes the dimensions of sufficiency and necessity. Table 2 presents the explainers’ performance along this metric. Notably, CoDy-*local-gradient* excels in explaining incorrect predictions, whereas CoDy-*spatio-temporal* is superior for correct predictions. This dual perspective is further illustrated in Appendix D, which compares the performance of the explainers in both *fid₊* and *fid₋* metrics. The *fid₊* and *fid₋* scores reveal that CoDy-*local-gradient* and CoDy-*spatio-temporal* not

only deliver excellent explanations in terms of necessity but also maintain comparably strong sufficiency. This underscores the significance of the fallback strategy, ensuring the provision of explanations even in the absence of counterfactual examples. This strategy is crucial, as exemplified by the fact that while the methods cannot find counterfactual explanations for all cases, depending on the experimental setting, they still deliver sufficient explanations in most cases. Thus, even though not all explanations are counterfactual, they consistently highlight pertinent input information.

5.2.4. COMPARISON OF SELECTION STRATEGIES

The performance of GreeDy and CoDy varies based on their selection strategies, affecting their operation in explanation approaches. Unlike the *random* strategy, other strategies enhance performance in exploring the search space, as shown by *fid₊* and *fid₋* metrics. The *spatio-temporal* strategy performs best for GreeDy, influencing predictions significantly. For CoDy, there’s no definitive best strategy. The *spatio-temporal* strategy excels in explaining correct predictions, while *local-gradient* is better for incorrect ones. CoDy-*temporal* generally ranks third. This pattern is also reflected in *char* scores. GreeDy’s explanatory performance is more influenced by the selection strategy than CoDy’s. CoDy adapts its search based on initial results, exploring other directions if necessary, while GreeDy sticks to its initial path, making it more dependent on the selection strategy and prone to local optima. Overall, the *spatio-temporal* and *local-gradient* strategy is superior in most settings for both GreeDy and CoDy, highlighting spatial proximity’s importance in link prediction models.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, two novel counterfactual explanation methods are proposed for Temporal Graph Neural Networks. Extensive evaluation reveals that CoDy, which adapts Monte Carlo Tree Search, outperforms GreeDy and a factual explanation method T-GNNExplainer, providing counterfactual examples more frequently and with lower complexity. The experiments also uncover that the heuristic selection strategy has a large effect on explanatory performance. Using a selection strategy that considers spatio-temporal aspects and local gradients to select promising events for the explanation is preferable over random selection.

Counterfactual examples do not have to be limited to the omission of information but could also encompass adding events to the input, changing the node and edge features, or changing the timing of events. However, incorporating these dimensions would inevitably result in a substantial expansion of the search space, necessitating the development of novel methods to effectively navigate and address these more complex circumstances.

References

- Amara, K., Ying, Z., Zhang, Z., Han, Z., Zhao, Y., Shan, Y., Brandes, U., Schemm, S., and Zhang, C. Graphframex: Towards systematic evaluation of explainability methods for graph neural networks. In *Learning on Graphs Conference, LoG 2022, 9-12 December 2022, Virtual Event*, volume 198 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 44. PMLR, 2022.
- Baldassarre, F. and Azizpour, H. Explainability techniques for graph convolutional networks. *CoRR*, abs/1905.13686, 2019.
- Byrne, R. M. J. Counterfactuals in Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI): Evidence from Human Reasoning. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 6276–6282, July 2019. doi: 10.24963/ijcai.2019/876.
- Chen, J. and Ying, Z. Tempme: Towards the explainability of temporal graph neural networks via motif discovery. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- Cho, K., Van Merriënboer, B., Gulcehre, C., Bahdanau, D., Bougares, F., Schwenk, H., and Bengio, Y. Learning phrase representations using rnn encoder-decoder for statistical machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.1078*, 2014.
- European Parliament. Proposal for a regulation of the european parliament and of the council laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (artificial intelligence act) and amending certain union legislative acts, 2021.
- Fan, Y., Yao, Y., and Joe-Wong, C. Gcn-se: Attention as explainability for node classification in dynamic graphs. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*, pp. 1060–1065. IEEE Computer Society, 2021.
- He, W., Vu, M. N., Jiang, Z., and Thai, M. T. An explainer for temporal graph neural networks. In *IEEE Global Communications Conference, GLOBECOM 2022, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, December 4-8, 2022*, pp. 6384–6389. IEEE, 2022. doi: 10.1109/GLOBECOM48099.2022.10011619.
- Huang, Q., Yamada, M., Tian, Y., Singh, D., Yin, D., and Chang, Y. Graphlime: Local interpretable model explanations for graph neural networks. *CoRR*, abs/2001.06216, 2020.
- Jumper, J., Evans, R., Pritzel, A., Green, T., Figurnov, M., Ronneberger, O., Tunyasuvunakool, K., Bates, R., Židek, A., Potapenko, A., et al. Highly accurate protein structure prediction with alphafold. *Nature*, 596(7873):583–589, 2021.
- Kazemi, S. M., Goel, R., Jain, K., Kobayev, I., Sethi, A., Forsyth, P., and Poupart, P. Representation learning for dynamic graphs: A survey. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 21: 70:1–70:73, 2020.
- Kumar, S., Zhang, X., and Leskovec, J. Predicting Dynamic Embedding Trajectory in Temporal Interaction Networks. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pp. 1269–1278, Anchorage AK USA, July 2019. ACM. ISBN 978-1-4503-6201-6. doi: 10.1145/3292500.3330895.
- Kunegis, J. KONECT – The Koblenz Network Collection. In *Proc. Int. Conf. on World Wide Web Companion*, pp. 1343–1350, 2013. URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=2488173>.
- Lam, R., Sanchez-Gonzalez, A., Willson, M., Wyrnsberger, P., Fortunato, M., Pritzel, A., Ravuri, S., Ewalds, T., Alet, F., Eaton-Rosen, Z., et al. Graphcast: Learning skillful medium-range global weather forecasting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.12794*, 2022.
- Liu, Y. L., Zhang, X., and Xie, S. A differential geometric view and explainability of gnn on evolving graphs. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2023)*. International Conference on Learning Representations, 2023.
- Longa, A., Lachi, V., Santin, G., Bianchini, M., Lepri, B., Lio, P., Scarselli, F., and Passerini, A. Graph neural networks for temporal graphs: State of the art, open challenges, and opportunities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.01018*, 2023.
- Lucic, A., ter Hoeve, M. A., Tolomei, G., de Rijke, M., and Silvestri, F. Cf-gnnexplainer: Counterfactual explanations for graph neural networks. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, AISTATS 2022, 28-30 March 2022, Virtual Event*, volume 151 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 4499–4511. PMLR, 2022.
- Luo, D., Cheng, W., Xu, D., Yu, W., Zong, B., Chen, H., and Zhang, X. Parameterized explainer for graph neural network. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*, 2020.
- Ma, Y., Guo, Z., Ren, Z., Tang, J., and Yin, D. Streaming graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR 2020, Virtual Event, China, July 25-30, 2020*, pp. 719–728. ACM, 2020. doi: 10.1145/3397271.3401092.

- Makarov, I., Savchenko, A., Korovko, A., Sherstyuk, L., Severin, N., Mikheev, A., and Babaev, D. Temporal graph network embedding with causal anonymous walks representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.08754*, 2021.
- Pope, P. E., Kolouri, S., Rostami, M., Martin, C. E., and Hoffmann, H. Explainability methods for graph convolutional neural networks. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2019, Long Beach, CA, USA, June 16-20, 2019*, pp. 10772–10781. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE, 2019. doi: 10.1109/CVPR.2019.01103.
- Prado-Romero, M. A., Prenkaj, B., Stilo, G., and Giannotti, F. A Survey on Graph Counterfactual Explanations: Definitions, Methods, Evaluation. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, September 2023. ISSN 0360-0300. doi: 10.1145/3618105. arXiv:2210.12089 [cs].
- Rossi, E., Chamberlain, B., Frasca, F., Eynard, D., Monti, F., and Bronstein, M. M. Temporal graph networks for deep learning on dynamic graphs. *CoRR*, abs/2006.10637, 2020.
- Schnake, T., Eberle, O., Lederer, J., Nakajima, S., Schütt, K. T., Müller, K., and Montavon, G. XAI for graphs: Explaining graph neural network predictions by identifying relevant walks. *CoRR*, abs/2006.03589, 2020.
- Souza, A. H., Mesquita, D., Kaski, S., and Garg, V. Provably expressive temporal graph networks. In *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- Stanley, R. P. *Enumerative Combinatorics*. Springer US, Boston, MA, 1986. ISBN 978-1-4615-9765-0 978-1-4615-9763-6. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4615-9763-6.
- Tan, J., Geng, S., Fu, Z., Ge, Y., Xu, S., Li, Y., and Zhang, Y. Learning and evaluating graph neural network explanations based on counterfactual and factual reasoning. In *WWW '22: The ACM Web Conference 2022, Virtual Event, Lyon, France, April 25 - 29, 2022*, pp. 1018–1027. ACM, 2022. doi: 10.1145/3485447.3511948.
- Trivedi, R., Farajtabar, M., Biswal, P., and Zha, H. Dyrep: Learning representations over dynamic graphs. In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019, New Orleans, LA, USA, May 6-9, 2019*. OpenReview.net, 2019.
- Vu, M. N. and Thai, M. T. Pgm-explainer: Probabilistic graphical model explanations for graph neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*, 2020.
- Vu, M. N. and Thai, M. T. On the limit of explaining black-box temporal graph neural networks. *CoRR*, abs/2212.00952, 2022. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2212.00952.
- Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., and Russell, C. Counterfactual explanations without opening the black box: Automated decisions and the gdpr. *Harv. JL & Tech.*, 31:841, 2017.
- Wu, Z., Pan, S., Chen, F., Long, G., Zhang, C., and Philip, S. Y. A comprehensive survey on graph neural networks. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 32(1):4–24, 2020.
- Xia, W., Lai, M., Shan, C., Zhang, Y., Dai, X., Li, X., and Li, D. Explaining temporal graph models through an explorer-navigator framework. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- Xie, J., Liu, Y., and Shen, Y. Explaining dynamic graph neural networks via relevance back-propagation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.11175*, 2022.
- Xu, D., Ruan, C., Körpeoglu, E., Kumar, S., and Achan, K. Inductive representation learning on temporal graphs. In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30, 2020*. OpenReview.net, 2020.
- Ying, Z., Bourgeois, D., You, J., Zitnik, M., and Leskovec, J. Gnnexplainer: Generating explanations for graph neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2019, NeurIPS 2019, December 8-14, 2019, Vancouver, BC, Canada*, pp. 9240–9251, 2019.
- Yuan, H., Tang, J., Hu, X., and Ji, S. XGNN: towards model-level explanations of graph neural networks. In *KDD '20: The 26th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, Virtual Event, CA, USA, August 23-27, 2020*, pp. 430–438. ACM, 2020. doi: 10.1145/3394486.3403085.
- Yuan, H., Yu, H., Wang, J., Li, K., and Ji, S. On explainability of graph neural networks via subgraph explorations. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2021, 18-24 July 2021, Virtual Event*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 12241–12252. PMLR, 2021.
- Yuan, H., Yu, H., Gui, S., and Ji, S. Explainability in graph neural networks: A taxonomic survey. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 45(5):5782–5799, 2023. doi: 10.1109/TPAMI.2022.3204236.
- Zhao, L., Song, Y., Zhang, C., Liu, Y., Wang, P., Lin, T., Deng, M., and Li, H. T-gcn: A temporal graph convolutional network for traffic prediction. *IEEE transactions on intelligent transportation systems*, 21(9):3848–3858, 2019.

A. Example Greedy

Algorithm 1: Greedy search algorithm for counterfactual examples.

Input: Link prediction function f , input graph \mathcal{G} , explained event ε_i , selection strategy δ , number of nodes to sample in each iteration l
Output: best explanation found \mathcal{X}

```

1  $prediction_{orig} \leftarrow f(\mathcal{G}(t_i), \varepsilon_i)$ ;
2  $n_{root} \leftarrow (\emptyset, prediction_{orig}, null, \emptyset)$ ;
3  $n_{best} \leftarrow n_{root}$ ;
4 while  $s_{best}$  does not include all candidate events  $C(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon_i, k, m_{max})$  do
5    $children_{n_{best}} \leftarrow$  set of  $l$  child node with highest rank according to  $\delta$ , each child
    $n_{child}$  initialized with prediction  $prediction_{child} = f((\mathcal{G}(t_i) \setminus s_{child}), \varepsilon_i)$ ;
6    $n_{best\_child} \leftarrow \arg \max_{n_j \in children_{n_{best}}} \Delta(prediction_{orig}, prediction_j)$ ;
7   if  $\Delta(prediction_{best}, prediction_{best\_child}) > 0$  then
8     /*  $n_{best\_child}$  shifts the prediction further towards the opposite sign of
       the original prediction */
9      $n_{best} \leftarrow n_{best\_child}$ ;
10    if  $\Delta(prediction_{orig}, prediction_{best}) > |prediction_{orig}|$  then
11      /*  $s_{best}$  is a counterfactual example */
12      break;
13    end
14  else
15    break;
16  end
17 return  $s_{best}$ 

```

Figure 2 depicts the operation of Greedy. Each iteration involves selecting three past events ($l = 3$) using a strategy δ . Starting from the root node, node n_2 is chosen as the best node (n_{best}) in the first iteration, with a perturbation set $s_2 = \varepsilon_2$ and a prediction score of 1.996. As iterations proceed, the prediction score of n_{best} decreases until it becomes negative in the third iteration. At this point, the search ends, yielding the counterfactual example $\mathcal{X} = s_9 = \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_5$.




Figure 2. Example for the operation of the Greedy approach.

B. Example CoDy

Figure 3 illustrates the CoDy algorithm’s search process in constructing a partial search tree. In this example, three past events, $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3$, are considered as candidate events. Initially, the root node’s simulation yields a prediction score of 3.179, indicating a likely future link. The first expansion adds child nodes for each event. In the second iteration, selection strategy δ chooses node n_2 , which is then expanded to include combinations $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2$ and $\varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3$. The third iteration focuses on node n_5 , adding a child node $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3$. The fourth iteration involves selecting and backpropagating node n_6 , rendering it and its parent n_5 unselectable.

In the fifth iteration, due to high exploration scores, node n_1 is selected over n_2 . Its simulation results in a negative score, identifying a counterfactual example. Dynamic constraints then mark nodes with more than one element in their perturbation set as unselectable, affecting node n_4 and subsequently n_2 . Finally, node n_3 is selected as the only remaining option. With no nodes left to explore, the search concludes, selecting node n_1 and its associated perturbation set ε_1 as the minimal counterfactual example.




Figure 3. Schematic depiction of the iterative expansion of the partial search tree.

C. Fidelity+ to Sparsity




Figure 4. Results on the relation between fid_+ and $sparsity$ for the different experimental settings.

D. Fidelity+ to Fidelity-




Figure 5. Results on the fid_+ score in relation to the fid_- score achieved by the explanation approaches.

E. Runtime




Figure 6. Average duration for explaining predictions across various settings.

Figure 6 presents the average explanation times across datasets. GreeDy consistently requires the least time, with its *local-gradient* variant taking longer due to more frequent calls to the link prediction function, as detailed in Table 3. In

comparison, CoDy calls this function more often than GreeDy, which concludes explanations upon finding a counterfactual example or reaching a search impasse. CoDy, in contrast, continues until a set number of iterations are completed or the search tree is fully explored.

Regarding explanation duration, CoDy, GreeDy, and T-GNNExplainer spend 97.85%, 99.83%, and 82.72% of their time, respectively, on calling the link prediction function. This suggests that a faster link prediction model could reduce explanation times. Notably, T-GNNExplainer allocates more time to the search process than the other methods.

Table 3 shows consistent call frequencies to the prediction model across datasets for each explainer. However, CoDy and GreeDy show significant variation in explanation times across datasets, especially on the Wikipedia dataset. This could be due to the dataset’s longer model response times, possibly because of its edge features and larger size compared to the other datasets.

Overall, GreeDy offers the shortest explanation durations, making it preferable for rapid explanations.

	UCI-Messages		UCI-Forums		Wikipedia	
	Correct	Wrong	Correct	Wrong	Correct	Wrong
<i>GreeDy-random</i>	27.10	23.40	24.80	21.80	23.15	18.55
<i>GreeDy-temporal</i>	43.70	29.85	36.15	29.15	32.30	24.65
<i>GreeDy-spatio-temporal</i>	57.60	29.40	37.65	35.25	39.35	22.35
<i>GreeDy-local-gradient</i>	100.15	79.18	88.10	78.15	80.47	69.36
<i>CoDy-random</i>	287.91	246.83	261.13	257.23	284.52	237.16
<i>CoDy-temporal</i>	287.92	245.64	261.23	256.31	284.85	236.26
<i>CoDy-spatio-temporal</i>	287.95	245.44	260.95	256.44	284.98	236.26
<i>CoDy-local-gradient</i>	346.50	292.23	312.00	305.70	339.90	272.52

Table 3. Results on the average number of calls to the link prediction function performed by the explanation methods for the different experimental settings.

F. Search Iterations

In the experiments with CoDy, a key parameter is the maximum number of search iterations (it_{max}), initially set at 300. Further investigation on performance involved increasing it_{max} to 1200, specifically focusing on correct predictions in the Wikipedia dataset where GreeDy-*spatio-temporal* surpasses all CoDy variants. Figure 7 illustrates the fid_+ scores relative to the number of iterations, highlighting that CoDy variants eventually outperform GreeDy counterparts, albeit with varying iteration requirements. While *random* and *local-gradient* strategies require fewer iterations, CoDy-*spatio-temporal* and CoDy-*temporal* need close to 1000 and 1200 iterations, respectively, for superiority.




Figure 7. Comparison of fid_+ scores for various explanation methods on the Wikipedia dataset, highlighting CoDy’s performance over iterations.

The figure reveals that CoDy can potentially find the minimal counterfactual example with unlimited iterations, by exploring the entire search space. However, the high iteration count for certain CoDy variants to outperform GreeDy indicates a need for optimizing the hyperparameters α and β , which balance exploration and exploitation. This is inferred from GreeDy’s initial superiority, suggesting its more effective exploration of the search space. CoDy’s delay in matching GreeDy’s partial search tree performance implies an imbalance in its search strategy.

G. Similarities in Explanations

The Jaccard similarity is used to compare explanations from various explainers, focusing on correct predictions in the Wikipedia dataset (Figure 8). This heatmap serves as a representative example. T-GNNExplainer’s explanations differ significantly from those of GreeDy and CoDy, partly due to their lower sparsity (Table 2). GreeDy-*temporal* and GreeDy-*spatio-temporal* show high similarity, as do GreeDy-*spatio-temporal* and CoDy explanations.

Comparatively, CoDy variants’ explanations are more similar to each other. CoDy-*temporal* and CoDy-*spatio-temporal* have high similarities with each other and with CoDy-*local-gradient*. This indicates CoDy’s search procedure’s ability to explore similar areas, highlighting the likeness of *temporal*, *spatio-temporal*, and *local-gradient* strategies over the *random* strategy.




Figure 8. Results on the Jaccard similarity between explanations of correct predictions on the Wikipedia dataset.